strikes often break out for frivolous reasons and are ruinous to the industry.

Trade unionists also criticise the phrase in the Bombay memorandum which refers to "provision of *alternative* occupations in periods of *inevitable* unemployment." They think this phrase sinister, suggesting that employers are preparing for rationalisation, which would mean "inevitable" unemployment. There is also the question of what would be the wages of these "alternative" occupations? They fear labour camps *a la* Hitler. "3 annas earned in the cottage industry was, any day, better than 12 annas in the slum area," said the Parliamentary Secretary in the *Bombay Chronicle.*

Two Enquiry Committees have sat in Bombay and Cawn-pore and have made their reports; both advocate wage increases, and the Gawnpore Report has been vehemently criticised by the employers, who accuse it of having been unduly influenced by the union. Among other things, it advocates holidays with pay, labour bureaux and the recognition of the union after being reconstituted.

It is desirable that legislative measures should be inspired by the workers[3] representatives. The owners dread having to deal with the organised and collective might of their employees instead of with helpless individuals. The bureaucracy was accustomed to make a distinction between "genuine unions and red organisations." The Bombay memorandum refers to "genuine[59] unions, and the Calcutta conference laid down as a basis for State recognition the acceptance of the policy of "using peaceful and legitimate means." But many unionists object to such qualifications and demand the recognition of all duly registered unions.

The Left has criticised the action of the ministries during the strikes. Firing was resorted to in Cawnpore, and Section 144 of the Police Code has been applied to labour leaders. In Bombay and Sholapur police action was used against